

Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action dated February 8, 2006, and the Advisory Action of June 2, 2006, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. In the present application, independent claims 16 and 30 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 16, 18, 20-27, 29-30, 32, 34-41, 43, 45, and 47 are rejected as being unpatentable over Bossemeyer in view of Paarsmarkt. Claims 45 and 47 have been canceled.

In furtherance of prosecution, it is respectfully submitted that Bossemeyer in view of Paarsmarkt fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claims 16 and 30. As a representative example, claim 16 recites a system comprising a computing device, wherein the computing device responds to the recognizable dial tone by querying the message server for the incoming message and receives the incoming message from the message server. Such recitations are supported by the discussion related to FIG. 2, and particularly elements 209, 211, and 213.

Neither Bossemeyer nor Paarsmarkt disclose such recitations. While Bossemeyer may disclose the manual off-hook resulting in receiving a stutter dial tone that indicates a waiting message, Bossemeyer fails to disclose that the off-hook detection of the stutter dial tone results in a computing device automatically querying a message server for the waiting message. Thus, for the sake of argument, even if it would be obvious to use a computer terminal of Bossemeyer to automatically check for a stutter dial tone by going off-hook as asserted in the obvious action, Bossemeyer still fails to disclose that the computing device queries for the message in response to the stutter dial tone. Bossemeyer has only contemplated providing indicators of waiting messages and has failed to contemplate automatically querying for those waiting messages.

Paarsmarkt also fails to account for these deficiencies. Paarsmarkt discloses forwarding of an email to a remote device, but Paarsmarkt fails to disclose querying a message server for a waiting message, particularly in response to a going off-hook to detect a stutter dial tone. Based on the foregoing discussion, amended independent claims 16 and 30 are allowable over the cited references of record for at least these reasons. Furthermore, dependent claims 18, 20-27, 29, 32, 34-41, and 43 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due beyond the fee for continued examination and a two-month extension. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2006

/Jeramie J. Keys/
Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(404) 849-2093